

**REMARKS**

Claims *1-25* are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant has amended claim 19.

**I. Preliminary Matters**

The Examiner has acknowledged the claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents. The Examiner has also accepted the drawings filed on May 17, 2006.

The Examiner has initialed the bottom of the PTO SB08 form, submitted on May 17, 2006, indicating that all references have been considered except where lined through. Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering all the listed references.

**II. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claim according to the Examiner's suggestion, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walls in view of Sharma.

Applicant submits that Sharma can be removed as a reference by perfecting a claim to foreign priority. The above-identified application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 from Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-388624, which has a priority date of November 19, 2003. Furthermore, the filing date of Sharma, April 23, 2004, is after the priority date of the Japanese Patent Application from which the instant application claims priority. Therefore, Sharma may be removed as a prior art reference by perfecting the claim to foreign priority by filing a verified translation of the foreign priority document.

Accordingly, Applicant is submitting a verified translation of Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-388624 to perfect the claim to priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 are fully supported by the priority document. Since Applicant has perfected priority for the present application and since the priority documents fully support the claimed subject matter, Applicant submits that Sharma does not qualify as prior art.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/579,856

Attorney Docket No.: Q94999

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel C. Wilks  
Registration No. 62,867

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 16, 2008